

CITY OF BELLEVUE
DOWNTOWN LIVABILITY
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

June 18, 2014
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-108

MEMBERS PRESENT: Aaron Laing, Ernie Simas, co-chairs; Patrick Bannon, Michael Chaplin, Mark D'Amato, Gary Guenther, Trudi Jackson, Lee Maxwell, Erin Powell, Jan Stout

MEMBERS ABSENT: Hal Ferris, Brad Helland, Loretta Lopez, Ming Zhang

OTHERS PRESENT: Dan Stroh, Emil King, Patti Wilma, Department of Planning and Community Development

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER, APPROVAL OF AGENDA, APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m. by Co-chair Simas.

Co-chair Simas noted that over the last year there has been a lot of discussion of the issues, including building height and form and parking. He said the goal of the meeting was to bring it all together into a coherent package. He said following the meeting the staff would polish and finish off the report. The report will likely not be before the City Council until September so there will be plenty of time to note and correct any errors or emissions in the final report.

Co-chair Laing commended the staff on the meeting materials. He said he was aware of the fact that a tremendous amount of work went into getting the materials ready for the final meeting.

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Mr. D'Amato. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jackson and it carried unanimously.

A motion to approve the May 21, 2014, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Maxwell. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stout and it carried unanimously.

2. RECAP OF PUBLIC COMMENT FROM JUNE 3 OPEN HOUSE/FOCUS GROUPS AND OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

Planning Director Dan Stroh reminded the Committee that the Downtown Livability Initiative was kicked off with approval by the Council of the scope and guiding principles

near the end of 2012. The Committee began meeting in May of 2013 and along the way there has been ample opportunity for the public to offer comments. The effort focused on the Land Use Code audit and the issues it identified. The alternatives workshop in January 2014 established a list of specifics which the Committee then tackled one-by-one.

Mr. Stroh clarified that the process will not be completed once the Committee signs off on the final report. A lot of heavy lifting will need to be done to put together a package of Land Use Code amendments for the Council to consider. The Council will decide whether or not to forward the amendments to the staff and the Planning Commission to take things to the next level. There will be a full round of public involvement associated with the work of the Planning Commission, including a formal public hearing. The Planning Commission will then forward its recommendations on to the Council for final action no earlier than the first or second quarter of 2015.

Senior Planner Patti Wilma said the June 3 open house/focus group event was very well attended. More than 70 attended the open house and about 40 participated in the focus groups. Following the event some 40 additional comments were sent in by the public. She pointed out that there was general support for the direction given to staff by the Committee regarding the pedestrian corridor, open space, through-block connections, the design guidelines and the amenities system, and the quality of the comments made was very high. The public wants the pedestrian corridor to be a place for people and usable by pedestrians and bicycles. The importance of open space in making the Downtown livable was highlighted along with the need to make them visible and accessible and to keep them well maintained. With regard to the design guidelines, the public outlined a desire for variety and allowing light and air to reach the street level through the use of appropriate tower spacing, location, and modulation. The public stressed the need for the amenity system to focus on livability with a balance between commercial and residential development. The majority of the comments regarding building height and form were not in support of height and FAR increases, though there were some positive comments. Concerns were voiced about the edges of the Downtown and how the perimeter districts will be treated. The main issues concerning height and form related to view blockage, privacy, shadows, wind, light and air. The public also stated that more density will generate more traffic and congestion. The comments around parking centered on the fact that parking is hard to find and in some cases inadequate; that mixing commercial and residential parking does not work; and that the Downtown needs a public parking garage. The need to protect the surrounding neighborhoods was stressed, particularly by providing adequate parking to prevent spillover.

Mr. Bannon said it was good to see how many turned out for the open house/focus group event. The conversations were robust and the attendees were well informed. The resulting input was great, though in many cases it would have been good to have much earlier in the process.

Ms. Stout agreed but said she would have liked to see more people stay and participate in the focus groups.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Jim Stanton with Microsoft said the company has 43,000 employees in the Puget Sound area and 1.3 million square feet of office space in Bellevue. As of April 2014, 7,800 of the company's employees were working in Bellevue, 5,700 of which are in the Downtown. About 7,200 of the company's employees live in the city of Bellevue; only Redmond and Seattle are home to more Microsoft employees. It is typical of the technology industry to put more employees in less space in that it fosters collaboration, and the same is true in Bellevue. Mobility continues to be a significant logistical issue for the company, both in terms of commuting and business operations. Microsoft spends about \$30 million annually moving people to accomplish both of those goals using a connector shuttle service, Orca passes, rideshare options, as well as showers, lockers and bicycle facilities. Over the year the company has moved the needle from a 70/30 modesplit to a 60/40 modesplit. With more people in less space, there comes an increased demand for parking. In Downtown Bellevue the shortage of parking is concerning. The company uses a variety of options to address the issue, including valet parking and leasing off-site spaces. The company is also a big supporter of light rail and as it comes to Bellevue the dynamics in the Downtown will change. The Bellevue Downtown environment is unique in terms of the opportunities. The city should carefully consider the notion of public garages and strategically placed parking. Monetizing parking has a way of encouraging the development of parking and regulating its use. All commute alternatives should continue to be supported in order to move further away from driving alone.

Mr. Bill Herman, a resident of Bellevue Towers, thanked the Committee for its hard work. He recommended against allowing 400-foot towers in the O-2 district south of NE 4th Street. The area is fully developed except for the block between 105th Avenue NE 106th Avenue NE and the southeast corner of 106th Avenue NE. The additional height would block the views of residents living in Bellevue Towers and would not further the livability goals set forth by the Committee. He shared with the Committee photos comparing how the view would change from his residence when looking out on a 250-foot building and a 400-foot building. Bellevue Towers residents purchased their units with the understanding that the views they enjoyed would be theirs forever. In addition to not increasing the lift by much, 400-foot towers in the block would increase Downtown traffic. The block is an appropriate location for a public parking garage or open/community space.

Ms. Michelle Herman, also a resident of Bellevue Towers, said she works in Bellevue, is able to walk to work on most days, and takes the bus when the weather is not conducive to walking. She voiced support for the notion of urban expansion over the alternative of urban sprawl, and noted her support for diversity in terms of building style and public/private spaces. She said she does not support super-high density, which is not the same thing as urban expansion. Assuring that light and air will reach the street level is of critical importance given the limited light that naturally occurs in the Northwest. Pedestrian commuters in the Downtown already are facing challenges caused by traffic

congestion; safety will only diminish unless steps are taken to keep congestion down. With regard to building height, she said it would be wrong to take away views that Downtown residents have paid a premium to have. There should be more emphasis on allowing tall buildings to occur near the transit center and the coming light rail station. She said she would love to see a public market or something like a European square developed on the southwest corner of NE 4th Street and 106th Avenue NE, along with pedestrian and jogging trails.

Ms. Betsy Blackstock, a resident of Surrey Downs at 712 109th Avenue SE, spoke as a past president and current board member of the Surrey Downs Community Club. She agreed with the comments made by the previous speakers. The primary concern of the Community Club relates to additional building height in the A and B perimeter design districts along Main Street. The current height limits are more than sufficient to provide additional growth capacity in the area. Under the existing limits, it is highly likely that buildout will result in overwhelming congestion conditions. Allowing additional height will only exacerbate the problem; even with the addition of light rail and other multimodal options, traffic and congestion will engulf the Downtown and the surrounding areas. The wedding cake design has over the years provided a reasonable and realistic transition between the Downtown and the surrounding neighborhoods and is part of what makes Bellevue unique. Surrey Downs agrees with most of the Committee's recommendations, but does not agree with the notion of allowing additional height.

Ms. Diana Thompson, 3115 103rd Avenue NE, voiced her opposition to allowing increased height and density in Downtown Bellevue and any abandonment or modification of the wedding cake approach. It is highly likely that many who live in or around the Downtown also oppose additional height but have not given input. Having the word "Downtown" in the name of the Committee implies that only those who live in the Downtown area will be affected by the changes. The changes being considered will in fact affect residents in all parts of the city and will increase the urban nature of the Downtown. The residents of the neighborhoods surrounding the Downtown will be particularly impacted. With more people in the Downtown there will be more traffic and it will be less desirable for those who live in other parts of the city. Traffic on Bellevue Way is already bad and is continuing to grow worse. The wedding cake approach that has been honored for so many years serves to protect the character of the neighborhoods adjacent to the Downtown. Taller buildings and increased traffic will make it less desirable to live in the surrounding single family neighborhoods. If additional height and density is allowed, in ten years there will be pressure to abandon the NE 12th Street boundary that protects the single family areas to the north.

Ms. Brittany Barker, 10112 NE 10th Street, said she is the fourth generation working the Fortin Group, the family business that owns the 11-acre property known as the Northwest Village. She noted that there are long-term leases with the current tenants and there is no intention of selling the properties any time soon, nor are there any current plans for redevelopment. The Downtown Livability Initiative process has, however, caused the family to think about the future of the properties and how they might contribute to the future of the city. Through careful analysis, it has become apparent that applying the

current zoning standards to the site will not provide a built environment consistent with resident and neighborhood needs, nor would the built environment accomplish the goals set forth by the city. With smart planning and managed growth, the properties could become a model of great urban design while retaining the neighborhood character and continuing to provide resident amenities. A team of urban design, transportation and land use experts has been assembled to better understand the opportunities, and a thoughtful and considerate master plan has been formulated for the properties that reflects the updated zoning under consideration by the Committee.

Mr. Matt Roewe, an architect and urban planner with VIA Architecture, said he has been working with Ms. Barker and the consultant team to explore the possibilities for the 11-acre Fortin Group site in Northwest Village. He said the property is one of the bigger sites in the Downtown and the team was asked to test what could happen. The large site could be broken up and have a new street introduced and pedestrian crossings created. By lifting the capacity, many of the goals planned for the neighborhood can be accomplished, including the creating of common areas, public spaces, town squares, plazas, and wider and more generous sidewalks. Because the focus of the Northwest Village area is residential, the team believes 90 percent of the development should be residential, supplemented with great stores, including grocery, drug, and retail. Squaring the A and B overlay districts should be done. Under the proposed increase in height and density, the site could support as many as six towers, but five would be a better outcome. Public amenities would be provided at the ground level all focused on creating a public realm with outdoor cafés, public space, and neighborhood-based gathering spaces. Given that the towers would have residences, the floor plates would be smaller. By staggering the building heights and keeping the podiums low, light and air will be maximized and shadowing will be minimized at the street level. Under the current code limits, the site could develop with 2.4 million square feet. The buildings would all be less than 100 feet tall but there would not be room for the public amenities. Adapting the C overlay onto the site, six 200-foot tall buildings could be constructed. The preference would be to have more discretion in how to apply the height, stepping it down to the north and bringing it up towards the mall, thus creating more variety and texture. Ideally, once the rules of engagement are set, the larger sites should be allowed to develop under a development agreement or a master plan to allow for certainty going forward.

Mr. Chow Dong Liu, a Northwest Village resident, thanked the Committee members for their hard work and for allowing the public to provide comment. He said he has lived in Bellevue for ten years and shops weekly at Bellevue Square. As currently developed, Northwest Village is not balanced compared to Bellevue Square. The opportunity exists to partner with a Chinese company that wants to build a retirement community. Height often equals amenities, including open space. The Chinese company will bring cultural amenities, a conference center, restaurants and a senior club. Allowing increased height will be beneficial for the city. Northwest Village is a good site for a retirement center given its proximity to Bellevue Square and Overlake Hospital.

Mr. Brian Brand with Baylis Architects, 10801 Main Street, spoke representing the Bellevue Downtown Association. He thanked the Committee members for the time and

devotion put into the process. The Committee has accomplished much of what the Bellevue Downtown Association recommended. He said the issue of livability is tied to economic viability for the city. More evaluation is needed regarding the two-tier development process that has been talked about a lot. The one track would be more formulaic and prescriptive, while the second would be more permissive and ultimately more creative by allowing developers to show how they can meet the ultimate objectives by taking a different path. The creative path may require a more discretionary approach and more scrutiny than the proposed administrative design review process gives. The Bellevue Downtown Association would like to see additional height and FAR allowed, but it should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis; not every site will be suitable for increased height and FAR. He provided the Committee with copies of a white paper from the Bellevue Downtown Association.

Mr. Carl Vander Hoek, 342 102nd Avenue SE, said he both lives and works in the Downtown. He said a huge part of what makes Bellevue livable is the shopping and restaurants, and the key to the success of those businesses is parking. The fact is the car is still the primary means of travel for the majority of people, and it will continue to be that way for some time to come. Outdoor seating for restaurants should be made part of the parking requirements. Outdoor seating is often an afterthought that is brought online after the building is created, after it is occupied, and after the city has any say in the required parking; the result is increased patronage without an increase in parking. The parking ratios should not be decreased. Seattle experimented with it in the past but the experiment failed. The city should also require residential guest parking. The requirement for residential guest parking should not be put on the shoulders of the building management who has little to say over how much parking is provided in the first place. It must be recognized that all residents in the Downtown have guests. If developers are not required to develop residential guest parking, the onus of accommodating the parking needs of visitors will be put on the shoulders of the commercial businesses, who need parking for their own customers. The recommendation of the Committee is to get rid of the 1,500 square foot credit. If that does not occur, the credit should not be allowed to be used elsewhere. The city should not count private parking as part of the public parking supply, which the latest parking study did. Private parking is designated and paid for by the businesses who should be allowed to use it. The parking required by the city is predicated on the uses the developer assumes will occupy the building; it should be taken as a guarantee that over time the parking that is actually needed will change. The city needs to find a way to address that problem.

Mr. Stu Vander Hoek, 9 103rd Avenue NE, also spoke representing the Bellevue Downtown Association. He added his appreciation for the efforts and perseverance of the Committee members. He said based on market and transportation realities, the Bellevue Downtown Association recommends against lowering the parking minimums. The city may want to further consider how project-specific independent parking studies could allow for a potential reduction in the residential minimums. All review criteria must be calibrated to the current and future projected market demand for allowed and proposed uses. The city should move forward in the upcoming budget with a comprehensive parking strategy for the Downtown. While the city has tried it before, it

should try it again and get it right. The study needs to be inclusive and should deeply involve property owners, residents and businesses in the research and evaluation. The city should help to resolve the parking supply problem in Old Bellevue. The best long-term strategy to support existing and future businesses is a new shared parking structure in close proximity to Main Street in Old Bellevue. The Bellevue Downtown Association also recommends further evaluation of allowing the transfer of development rights between zones in order to achieve greater architectural variety and opportunities to create engaging open spaces and on-the-ground experiences for pedestrians. The Bellevue Downtown Association also encourages the city to immediately pursue interim pedestrian corridor improvements in collaboration with adjacent property owners. Clearly the PACCAR property is the hole in the donut and until the city takes the initiative of working with the property owner, that section of the pedestrian corridor will remain unchanged. The vision for the pedestrian corridor has been on hold for 30 years; the city needs to get the item budgeted as something that will forward the city's economic and viability goals.

Ms. Susan Gibson, 9905 Belfair Lane, commented that the focus of the Committee's work has been inward. She suggested the focus should be aimed at the edges instead. The views of the residential properties all along 100th Avenue NE will be blocked by allowing additional height and FAR. Bellevue does not just exist in the center of the Downtown, it also exists around the edges and the impact on long-term existing residents must be taken into account in planning for the future. Change must be supported, but it must benefit everyone, not just the few.

4. REVIEW OF BUILDING HEIGHT AND FORM ALTERNATIVES FROM CAC'S JANUARY 15 ALTERNATIVES WORKSHOP

Mr. Stroh allowed that the topic of building height and form is clearly of interest to a lot of people and is very complex. There are all sorts of stakeholders, both in the Downtown and in the neighborhoods surrounding the Downtown. There has been a lot of discussion about the relationship between height and FAR and additional traffic impacts. The Committee is free to consider increased height alone, increased FAR alone, or increased height and FAR. Under the height alone scenario there would be no additional density; the same amount of building volume would be either spread out or elevated. Additional density is an element of increasing FAR.

Mr. Stroh said if the Committee recommends moving ahead with allowing additional height, there are a lot of pieces that will need to be gotten right when assembled into a code package. The issues of making sure views from public spaces are maintained, dealing with light, air and shadow impacts, achieving throughblock connections to assure walkability, will all need to be captured in the final package and spelled out clearly in the design guidelines.

The relationship between building height and livability is one issue that came out of the Land Use Code audit. Livability can be enhanced by being able to create a more distinctive skyline and through better and more memorable architecture, and open space

between buildings can be achieved by allowing greater height.

The issue of reinforcing district identity received a lot of discussion by the Committee. As the Downtown matures a sense of place is emerging, not just for the Downtown but for all neighborhoods of the Downtown. Getting the answers right could result in using building height as one method of developing amenities that will express the character of the different Downtown neighborhoods.

Mr. Stroh said if the Committee recommends to the Council looking at allowing additional height for some locations, the Committee's report should outline the principles that govern how the additional height should play out in the next stage.

The attention of the Committee members was called to Attachment 3 in the packet and the recommendations worksheet. Mr. Stroh noted that option 1A considers height alone or height plus density for the O-1 and O-2 districts, while option 2A considers height along or height plus density for the MU district. Option 2B considers height plus density increases in the OLB district. All of the rest of the options related to building height and form address height alone.

Ms. Jackson suggested that the direction of the Committee might depend on the direction given relative to options 2B through 3A. She noted that the Committee had already noted its support for holding onto the wedding cake approach, but a decision to allow more height in the center might necessarily impact how the edges should be treated in accord with the wedding cake outline. She suggested addressing the options relating to the edges first and her suggestion was adopted.

Starting the discussion with option 3A, Mr. Stroh highlighted the MU district on the map, explaining that the mixed use district essentially surrounds the Downtown. He stressed that it does not include the A or B overlay districts. Currently the code treats residential and non-residential buildings quite differently; the maximum FAR for a commercial building is 3.0, whereas the maximum FAR for a residential building is 5.0. Non-residential buildings are allowed a height of 100 feet, and a residential building is allowed 200 feet of height. The Land Use Code audit raised the question of whether or not the current approach incentivizes residential over non-residential. Residential towers tend to be much skinnier than office towers for a variety of factors.

Commissioner Laing said he appreciated having the graphic representations but noted that in actual practice what typically gets developed is something similar to the project on the Safeway site at Bellevue Way and NE 4th Street. Residential mixed use projects most often have a retail podium with a building above it.

Mr. Bannon said the current approach that treats commercial and residential differently was specifically formulated to move the market in a certain direction. At the time there were few Downtown residential units and the desire was to strive to achieve a critical mass. The market has responded accordingly. Going forward, the city should seek to capitalize on opportunities to capture jobs and development potential without

significantly upsetting the traffic situation and/or the design and look and feel of the community. It is no longer necessary to favor residential over commercial development.

Mr. Guenther said he absolutely agreed. The market should be allowed to build what it wants.

Co-chair Simas asked if there is a common process in cities such as Vancouver and Portland relative to residential and commercial development. Mr. Stroh said the residential towers in Vancouver are very beautiful and tend to have very narrow floorplates. The residential market has become very strong but some are concerned about the city losing its edge as the major regional employment center. Best practices dictate a need for a good mix of both residential and commercial. Downtown Bellevue is successful largely because it has both. The challenge going forward will be in maintaining the right urban form where office towers are constructed closer to the Downtown edges.

Ms. Maxwell commented that the MU district serves as a functional buffer between the Downtown and the single family neighborhoods around the Downtown. As such the district has a specific purpose in keeping the single family neighborhoods on the periphery healthy and strong. She asked what sort of employment might be located in the district, saying she would not want to see a big box store that might displace some of the functionality of the district.

Co-chair Simas stressed that the Committee is charged with developing a vision. The details will be worked out by the Planning Commission, the City Council and others.

Mr. D'Amato said he agreed in concept with the idea of equalization but suggested that of everything discussed by the Committee, it represents the largest single change from the status quo. It is also the issue around which there is the least knowledge of what the ultimate impact will be. The MU runs very close to Main Street which already has its own scale going. Should a taller office building suddenly be located there, it could change the look of the whole street.

Co-chair Simas pointed out that in passing along a recommendation the Committee is free to also outline any and all concerns.

Ms. Maxwell commented that the proposal to equalize non-residential and residential has the potential for severely compromising the development character of the nine Downtown districts. Residential is a good neighbor and is a good inspiration for good business in the Downtown core where there is ample capacity for commercial development.

Mr. Bannon said he did not know if there is all that much more capacity in the core. The MU district presents the opportunity to have a good blend of retail podiums and residential above. He agreed that livability issues could result from the change if the approach is not carefully implemented. The focus should be on addressing market

demands and providing for job opportunities in the Downtown.

Ms. Maxwell suggested looking at the MU district as a planned development, similar to what the Fortin Group has done with its properties. More discretion should be brought to the process of development in the district that would take into account what is already developed there and what the functionality of the district is. Co-chair Simas said to some degree that gets to the prescriptive/permissive process the Committee has discussed. Ms. Maxwell said discretionary planning and design review is needed when it comes to certain areas of the MU before it can be said the alternative would be appropriate.

Commissioner Laing said the Committee as part of its wrap up will talk about the idea of having the prescriptive and permissive processes. He said the materials suggest that will be a Downtown-wide process option. He asked Ms. Maxwell if she would be comfortable forwarding a recommendation favoring equalizing residential and non-residential on the understanding that a process will be developed that will apply to all of the Downtown. Ms. Maxwell said she could accept that approach.

Ms. Jackson agreed with Mr. D'Amato regarding the MU boundary near Main Street. A negotiated design review process would not call for lower heights in general along Main Street. Part of the problem with the MU district is the way the lines have been drawn.

Commissioner Laing stressed that electing to equalize residential and non-residential will not change the height or the massing of what could occur in the MU district. As things stand currently, a property owner could obtain a permit to build a 200-foot tall building with exactly the same massing. The only difference is a residential development would have an interior courtyard. From the perspective of the surrounding neighborhoods, however, there would be no visible difference between a residential and a commercial project. The distinction between residential and non-residential was originally implemented to create an incentive for residential. The distinction virtually assures that the only thing anyone will ever build in the MU district is residential because the FAR and height differential is so great. From the standpoint of impacts, the two types of development are the same and the question is whether or not the city should continue to incentivize residential development in the MU district. He said his personal opinion was that the two uses should be equalized.

Mr. D'Amato said the issue for him is changing the FAR from 3.0 to 5.0 for commercial, and commercial is what drives the traffic issues. Any proposal to make the change is likely to be shot down because there is no traffic study in hand to support it. Co-chair Simas said he could guarantee a traffic study will be done if the Committee recommends increasing the FAR for commercial in the MU district and the Council agrees. Mr. D'Amato remained hesitant. He said he could support the change only if the boundary were to be redrawn to make sure the neighborhoods on the perimeter will not be impacted. Co-chair Simas said that proposal could be made a part of the recommendation.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Stroh said the original concept as

scoped out and discussed by the Committee has been full equalization of residential and non-residential, leaving the code neutral with regard to one over the other. Such equalization naturally supposes that both height and FAR would be the same for both. An FAR of 3.0 with a 200-foot height limit cannot easily be expressed as an office building. Floorplates in office buildings currently are limited to 20,000 square feet in the MU district and the city has received a lot of pressure to increase the size to allow for the creation of more space accessible across the same floor. Mr. Chaplin pointed out that under the current approach a 200-foot residential tower can be constructed on the corner of Bellevue Way and Main Street. Equalizing residential and non-residential will not change the fact that the whole south face of the MU district could be lined with 200-foot residential towers.

Ms. Jackson said agreeing to the equalization must be coupled with an understanding of the fact that it will increase density in about half of the Downtown area. The public comments have been far more concerned with density than with height. Co-chair Simas said that is another of the concerns that could be voiced along with the Committee's recommendation. What the Committee needs to decide is whether or not equalization will benefit the livability of the Downtown.

Commissioner Laing pointed out that any zoning changes that occur will trigger a SEPA review. That is where the possible impacts will be highlighted.

Ms. Powell said she would not support the proposed change until the border issues are sorted out. She agreed with Ms. Jackson that the change represents a significant increase in density.

Mr. D'Amato allowed that the increase in allowed density will not automatically translate into increased density and increased traffic impacts.

Co-chair Simas said the concerns had been noted but saw a general consensus to move forward with recommending equalization.

Turning to option 2D, Mr. Stroh explained that the perimeter zoning was put in place in 1986 to try to create a better transition between the Downtown and the edges. The first 150 feet from the right-of-way of the Downtown is the A perimeter, and the B perimeter is typically the next 150 feet. Taken together they comprise the typical city block, or half of a superblock. Both the FAR and height are stepped down toward the edges. The jog in the border to the south of Main Street means that area only has the A perimeter district. At the January workshop there was almost an even split between those wanting to look at increases in the A and B district and those not wanting to. The issue was, however, moved forward.

Continuing, Mr. Stroh said the A district has an ultimate height limit of 55 feet with all available bonuses for residential and the 3.5 FAR maximum. Currently the B district allows up to 90 feet building height and an FAR of 5.0. The modeling considered allowing up to 70 feet height in the A district, without additional FAR, and 125 feet in the

B district, also without additional FAR. Those numbers were chosen based on building form. Above 75 feet the highrise development plateau is reached and it is necessary to meet a different set of building code requirements. The building form changes at that point. The idea for the B district was that once the highrise requirements are tripped, it is simply not economical to build to 90 feet.

Mr. Chaplin said Bellevue's success both inside and outside the Downtown boundary lines has been predicated in part on the understanding that things would not change. If people get the sense that there will be change in how the transition zone occurs, sales and rentals in the residential areas could increase and the areas could start to go downhill. He said from that standpoint it would be difficult for him to move beyond the status quo.

Ms. Powell voiced support for the status quo as well. Clearly that is the desire of the residential communities surrounding the Downtown.

Ms. Maxwell stressed the need to retain the stability for the single family areas that has been created over the years by the status quo. That stability can be continued by choosing not to effect any change in the A and B perimeter districts. At some point down the road it may become obvious that such a change is needed, but that time has not yet arrived.

Mr. Bannon said he appreciates the commentary and the history around the agreements that have been made in the past. He said he reviewed the 1991 wedding cake agreement and read all the news stories he could find. When the notion of updating the Land Use Code was broached about five years ago there was no intent to create more friction with the single family neighborhoods around the Downtown as well as the residential areas inside the Downtown. One of the reasons there has been support to at least consider modulation or additional height was the desire to have a better overall outcome. A buildout under the status quo might not result in an outcome the neighborhoods would want.

Ms. Maxwell pointed out that the single family neighborhoods around the Downtown are currently experiencing a high level of interest in remodeling and rebuilding. Clearly that can be tied to the status quo in the A and B perimeter districts. She allowed that there are not many exciting projects proposed for the districts.

Ms. Jackson suggested it would take more height to spur residential developers into doing something more interesting in the districts. She said the city should look to the neighborhoods rather than to the developers. The neighborhoods have accepted what is in place and the status quo should be retained.

A motion to keep the status quo on the 2D border all the way around was made by Ms. Powell. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stout.

Mr. Bannon said any consideration of increasing height should be coupled with a lot of careful study of the ramifications. He allowed, however, that absent a strong consensus it

would not make sense to move forward with the recommendation.

Mr. D'Amato commented that one of the goals of the Committee has been to allow greater interest to be injected into the skyline, both the low skyline and the high skyline. He said he is very familiar with the structural and cost differences between 55 feet and 70 feet. The status quo will keep the properties in the A district developed with unattractive two- and three-story wood frame buildings, the likes of which Bellevue already has a fair share. He said the height limit needs to be increased along with requirements to add shape and form to achieve a much more attractive perimeter to the Downtown.

Commissioner Laing said he favors the increasing the height limit to allow for five over one mixed use projects in the perimeter. From a livability standpoint, the difference between a 65-foot building and a 70-foot building is almost visually imperceptible, but with the increased height the residential units can be made far more livable and the commercial spaces can be made adaptable to more uses. He said he supported allowing up to 70 feet in the A district but did not support allowing up to 125 feet in the B district.

As maker of the motion, Ms. Powell agreed to amend her motion to recommend a maximum height of 70 feet in the A district and a maximum height of 90 feet in the B district. As seconder, Ms. Stout agreed to the amendment as well.

Ms. Jackson said the proposal equates to selling out the neighborhoods which have an expectation that the edges will not change. She said the Committee has been highly influenced by development realities and ideals, but what the neighborhoods want has also been made clear.

Ms. Wilma pointed out that robust design guidelines will need to be developed for all of the districts.

Ms. Maxwell asked if the maximum heights in the two districts are achievable only with extraordinary amenities. Co-chair Simas said that is not the case with the motion on the floor.

A vote being called for, six voted in favor and three voted against.

****BREAK****

Answering a question asked by Ms. Maxwell, Ms. Wilma said the position of the staff is that additional height in the perimeter districts would be achieved through the provision of exceptional amenities, though exactly what those amenities should be has not been determined. Mr. Stroh agreed and said amenities will be the basis on which additional height is granted; the other option would be a negotiated process that would result in better livability. In either case the livability outcomes will be better than those that could be achieved without the extra height.

Chair Simas asked how many in the audience live in neighborhoods adjacent to the

Downtown, and about ten people raised their hands. He then asked how many of the ten were satisfied with the recommendation made by the Committee, and two raised their hands. Six indicated they would prefer to retain the status quo, while one indicated support for allowing up to 70 feet in the A district and 125 feet in the B district. Those in the audience representing the development community stressed that they had not been asked to vote.

Ms. Maxwell said it was brought to her attention by a member of the public that the status quo is a misnomer in that most of the development in the A district is not in alignment with what the code allows.

Moving on to a discussion of option 2C, Ms. Wilma explained that the option relates to what is called the deep B area, specifically that portion of the B district that in the northwest corner of the Downtown extends an additional 600 to 900 feet beyond the typical B district boundary. Called the deep B area, the question is whether or not the current 90-foot height limit should be increased to 160 to 240 feet without increasing the FAR. She noted the additional height likely would result in smaller floorplates to capture the FAR, and more open space at the ground plane. The Fortin presentation offered a good example of how a larger piece of property could be developed.

Ms. Maxwell asked how many property owners have parcels in the deep B area and Ms. Wilma said there are about six. The Fortin Group holds about half of the total acreage.

Mr. Chaplin asked about the portion of Old Bellevue that is also deep B and has the Old Bellevue overlay. Senior Planner Emil King said that area was looked at during the initial scoping exercise. Part of the area is in the Downtown Park. The scoping looked at all of the remaining properties and concluded that with only one or two isolated sites it did not make sense to include the area. Ms. Wilma added that in the context of wanting to respond to the uniqueness of districts, Old Bellevue and its scale, heights of 160 to 240 would not be appropriate there.

Commissioner Laing said the Fortin Group presentation was helpful. He said what was shown to the Committee is not what will necessarily happen on their site, nor is it what would have to be the redevelopment scenario there. On many levels, what was shown in the presentation would be good for the Downtown and good for the neighborhoods. The presenter mentioned the idea of a development agreement. He said he would heartily support the Committee recommending a requirement for a development agreement as part of achieving any additional height. Seattle has something called a property use and development agreement under which upzones are achieved through what is effectively a development agreement that sets conditions and limits. Bellevue does not have a similar approach explicitly outlined in its Land Use Code.

Mr. Guenther commented favorably on the Fortin Group presentation and the opportunity it presents. He said the property owner has been in the community for a long time and cares about it. The proposal, which includes higher height, would be a good fit. The slide shown to the Committee depicting what can be done under the current zoning was

in fact ugly and uninviting.

Mr. D'Amato agreed that a development like what was outlined for the Fortin Group would be very good for Downtown Bellevue. Their presentation essentially represents a small planned community right on the doorstep of the Downtown. It could in fact set the tone for everything else done in the Downtown. There is, of course, no guarantee the site will be development as shown. He agreed the recommendation of the Committee should allow the extra height in association with design review to make sure the eventual outcome will meet the desired outcome of improved livability. It is too bad the city did not have a design review requirement in place before many of the buildings in the area were developed.

Ms. Stout said she strongly concurred with Mr. D'Amato. She said she had participated in two sessions with the Fortin Group and at one of the meetings suggestions were made to improve the angle of a couple of the buildings, the results of which were profound. She agreed the city should include a requirement for a development agreement, allowing for some flexibility to improve the aesthetics and potentially increase the amount of open space and maintain view corridors.

Ms. Maxwell asked if an overlay district could be created to cover the deep B district. Co-chair Simas said the Committee can recommend anything it wants.

Mr. D'Amato proposed recommending additional height to a maximum of between 160 and 240 feet in conjunction with an additional layer of scrutiny or a development agreement.

Ms. Maxwell pointed out that the Fortin Group proposal covers only half of the deep B area. A development agreement would cover their properties but not all of the properties, so it would be better to create an overlay district.

Ms. Stout said she suggested to the Fortin Group the notion of working with the community in a two-way dialog aimed at building trust and responding to some of the legitimate community needs.

There was consensus support for the proposal made by Mr. D'Amato.

Ms. Wilma said option 2B relates to the OLB district. She explained that the proposal is to allow the maximum building height for both residential and non-residential buildings between NE 4th Street and NE 8th Street to increase to 350 feet along with an increase in FAR from 3.0 to 6.0, and to allow the maximum building height for both residential and non-residential buildings between Main Street and NE 4th Street to increase to 200 feet along with an increase in FAR from 3.0 to 5.0. Mr. King explained that in May the Committee gave direction to scale back the proposal to increase height and FAR for the entire stretch between Main Street and NE 8th Street.

Mr. Stroh pointed out that the area in question has unusually low densities and heights

relative to the rest of the Downtown. It is sandwiched between light rail and the freeway and is essentially left out of the guidelines that operate across the rest of the Downtown. At the workshop the Committee gave direction to bring the area into the realm of the rest of the Downtown.

Ms. Powell noted that the Committee at one time talked about moving the line over to better align with the 2A and 2B areas. Mr. King said that was mentioned at the May meeting. He explained that staff reviewed the suggestion and concluded that it would actually result in a downzone for part of at least one property. The conditions there are different and staff believes it would not be appropriate to redraw the boundary.

Ms. Maxwell suggested MU might be more appropriate for the area. Extending that designation toward the east would provide for compatibility across 112th Avenue NE, as well as with the zoning to the south of Main Street where it would be good to see additional hospitality uses. Simply extending the wedding cake concept could result in some tall structures at the intersection of 112th Avenue NE and Main Street, which is directly across from single family. Ms. Wilma said the area in question is zoned OLB but has a height limit of 45 feet. Mr. King said the East Main station area planning group will be looking at the OLB/hospitality area from the Red Lion south. Ms. Maxwell said a lot of housing has gone up on the west side of 112th Avenue NE and it would be too bad to see a wall of development in the OLB that would keep the neighborhood from continuing from one side of 112th Avenue NE to the other side. Mr. King said based on the Committee's direction staff took the MU zoning with a 200-foot height limit and an FAR of 5.0 and extended it to the east side of 112th Avenue NE.

Mr. Guenther asked if there was any discussion about expanding the floorplates for the OLB. Mr. King said the idea was discussion but the conclusion reached was that east-west permeability is needed. There also are significant views toward Mt. Rainier and other places that need to be preserved.

There was general agreement to recommend the proposed changes outlined in option 2B, including the caveat regarding orientation.

Ms. Wilma said option 2A contemplates either additional height alone or additional height with additional FAR for the MU district. She noted that the issue is separate from the issue of equalization. As proposed, residential would increase from 200 feet to 300 feet, either at the current FAR of 5.0 or with an increase in the FAR to 6.0, and non-residential would increase from 100 feet to 200 feet, either at the current FAR of 3.0 or with an increase in the FAR to 5.0. She noted that larger residential floorplates could result higher up, though the city would look for more residential space in the design guidelines. The additional height would be permitted in exchange for the provision of exceptional amenities.

Mr. Bannon commented that the value of exceptional amenities has not been determined, nor has the Committee taken a full look at potential development process improvements. Certainly the key argument in favor of additional FAR is the provision of exceptional

amenities, but without having them specifically outlined a certain level of trust is required in recommending an increase in the FAR.

Mr. Chaplin asked if the Committee could recommend both options 2A and 3A or only one or the other. Mr. D'Amato pointed out that in option 2A the Committee could recommend height alone. Mr. Chaplin agreed but pointed out if additional height and FAR are recommended for option 2A, and if option 3A is recommended, the result will be a recommendation for height of up to 200 feet and FAR of up to 6.0. Mr. Chaplin said recommending height only for option 2A and recommending equalization proposed in 3A would in reality be taking both height and FAR. He suggested height alone for option 2A.

There was consensus to recommend an increase in height only for option 2A.

Ms. Wilma said option 1A contemplates additional height and FAR in the O1 and O2 districts. As proposed, residential and commercial would increase in the O1 district to 600 feet without changes to the FAR, or to 600 feet with an increase in the FAR to 9.6 for commercial and without a limit for residential which is the current code. For the O2 district, height would increase to 400 feet without additional FAR, or to 400 feet with an increase in the FAR to 7.2 for both residential and commercial. As with the other options, extraordinary amenities would be required along with urban design to obtain the additional height and FAR. The taller buildings could achieve more variety along with more open space.

Mr. Stroh reminded the Committee of the concerns voiced by the community relative to allowing increased height and FAR in the O2 district near the Bellevue Towers development.

Ms. Maxwell expressed concerns about the northern and southern O2 districts. The issues facing the northern area are similar to those facing the southern area. The significant height increase proposed would certainly impact the residential area to the north and east of the northern O2 are. She suggested not recommending height increases for either the northern or southern O2 areas. At the very most, heights should be no greater than those allowed in the MU.

Mr. Chaplin noted that under the status quo the maximum height in the O1 district is 300 feet for residential districts, unless a bonus is obtained from construction of the pedestrian corridor. He asked if there would be other methods used to provide the boost or if the pedestrian corridor development requirement would be dropped to hit the 450 height mark for non-residential. Ms. Wilma said it is likely the proposal would include modifications that would give clearer direction on how to get to the 450 height. Mr. Chaplin pointed out that if residential goes to a height limit of 300 feet in the MU and the status quo is retained in the O2, which is 250 feet, the wedding cake approach will in fact be reversed. That issue should be carefully considered. If something is not done with floorplates, or with the requirement to offer a more extreme architectural approach in order to gain an amenity, the result will simply be taller flattops. Developers will always

seek to maximize their floorplates. Incentives should be used as the way to allow buildings to get all the way to the 600-foot mark.

Mr. D'Amato commented that careful design consideration given to building orientation could minimize the impacts on the Bellevue Towers residents.

Mr. Chaplin proposed recommending additional height, with the caveat of looking at the O2 district with an eye on limiting height there to the residential height allowed in the adjacent MU zones. Ms. Maxwell reiterated that the caveat should apply only to the north and south portions of the O2 district. Ms. Guenther said he would not recommend also increasing the FAR for non-residential.

Ms. Powell voiced her support for the status quo. Ms. Stout concurred.

Ms. D'Amato said if the status quo is retained, the Committee will have achieved nothing. The only way to achieve extraordinary amenities will be to offer something in return.

Ms. Maxwell said she was uncomfortable talking about additional height without knowing what the extraordinary amenities will be. Mr. D'Amato said the change is needed in order to avoid property line-to-property line development and incentives are needed to achieve that goal.

Ms. Maxwell asked what percentage of the 1A area has been built out. Mr. King said in rough numbers close to half of the total area is yet to be redeveloped. She said she wants to see some serious extraordinary amenities by increasing the height to 600 feet in the core of the Downtown. She stressed that she opposed also increasing the FAR.

Ms. Jackson commented that the desire to retain the wedding cake creates a slippery slope because as height is raised in one area it must also be raised in another. A recommendation to allow the 1A area to have 600-foot buildings should not come without ensuring the additional height will only be permitted through the provision of truly extraordinary amenities. Co-chair Simas reminded the Committee that it is free to recommend additional height but only so far as extraordinary amenities are provided.

Mr. Stroh reiterated staff's understanding that the desire of the Committee is to require the provision of extraordinary amenities in return for additional height, either through the standard amenity system or a negotiated process that will deliver a comparable result. He said he also understood the caveat to apply to all areas of the Downtown. He allowed that the devil will be in the details. The Committee spent quite a lot of time discussing the amenities that matter in the Downtown relative to achieving improved livability. As the process moves forward, it will be very challenging to put meat on the bones both in terms of what amenities are worth and drafting the alternative process aimed at achieving an equivalent result.

Mr. D'Amato pointed out that design review and proportionality need to be made part of the design guidelines. Stepbacks need to occur at certain levels, and view corridors must

be considered. Mr. Stroh agreed. He said there are certain things the design guidelines require for every development; they represent the basic field that everyone must play on. Those by definition are not extraordinary amenities. Extraordinary amenities will need to be another layer on top of the basic requirements.

Ms. Powell reiterated her desire to keep the status quo. Co-chair Simas asked her if she would be willing to accept additional height in exchange for the provision of extraordinary measures. Ms. Powell said that would be easier to answer if what the list of extraordinary amenities will include.

Mr. Bannon said he envisioned allowing additional height in exchange for such things as interesting rooftops, light and air at the ground level, and open space. Ms. Maxwell said she would add to that list livability in the form of a park or a fee-in-lieu for something valuable to the community and profound.

Mr. Chaplin pointed out that under the status quo any non-residential building wanting to exceed 300 feet must build part of the pedestrian corridor. The same approach should be considered in allowing up to 600 feet, though it may be in exchange for providing something more than the pedestrian corridor.

Mr. Chaplin proposed drafting a recommendation to allow additional height in the O1 district, evaluating height in the O2 district based on comparison with the adjacent MU to the north and south.

Ms. Powell reiterated that she would need to see the list of extraordinary amenities before agreeing to the recommendation.

Ms. Maxwell said she would agree with the recommendation provided it specifically referenced additional height only in exchange for extraordinary amenities. Ms. Powell added that all extraordinary amenities need to be accessible to all people; there should be no private plazas or private building top green spaces. Mr. D'Amato concurred.

There was agreement to move ahead with the proposal offered by Mr. Chaplin as amended to include reference to extraordinary amenities.

5. REVIEW OF DOWNTOWN PARKING STRATEGIES FROM CAC'S JANUARY 15 ALTERNATIVES WORKSHOP

Given the hour, Co-chair Simas sought direction from the Committee relative to continuing the meeting or scheduling an additional meeting.

Ms. Stout suggested the only way for the Committee to continue the meeting with a discussion of parking would be to agree with the need for a comprehensive Downtown parking plan. She said the Committee simply does not have sufficient information to make a good decision.

Mr. Bannon agreed. He added that based on the evidence and commentary from the Committee and the public to date he has seen no justification for recommending any reduction in the parking minimums. He also noted that the Committee has heard loud and clear that there is a need for a shared use facility, particularly for Old Bellevue.

Ms. Jackson pointed out that the Committee had discussed not including underground parking on the list of things developers can do to achieve additional height and FAR. Mr. Chaplin noted that while the issue had been discussed, not everyone agreed with that approach.

Ms. Jackson also stated that the parking study done for the city and provided to the Committee seemed to indicate that there is sufficient parking and that everything is going to be fine. That report was objected to by the Committee. She asked if it is possible to get a parking study that will satisfy all parties. Co-chair Simas said the Committee would need to include in its recommendation to the Council that while the parking study was informative it did not solve the problem or get at the answer, and that the city should go back in search of a different answer.

There was consensus that the Committee lacked sufficient information on which to base any recommendation at all in lieu of the study, and to include a recommendation for the city to go back and look at parking on a more comprehensive basis, including taking a serious look at a shared parking facility.

Mr. Chaplin pointed out that developers must address the demands of those who want to occupy their buildings. Sometimes those demands are different from what the code allows. Any solution will need to include a method for addressing the demands in advance of seeing any kind of benefit from light rail. Ms. Maxwell suggested the comprehensive study should address that.

Co-chair Simas suggested that allowing for a departure from the minimum prescriptive parking requirements ahead of the city completing a parking study could be part of the Committee's recommendation.

Ms. Jackson said that type of thinking is partly responsible for the situation the city faces currently in terms of lack of parking. She said the Committee is not armed with the data needed to make such a recommendation.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Bill Herman said one of the reasons he included a picture of the current skyline in his submittal to the Committee was to indicate there is currently no real problem in search of a solution. There is variability, there is architectural interest, and not all buildings are just boxes. The statement has been made that additional height will not lead to greater density. The fact is most projects in the Downtown do not currently reach their full potential of FAR, but by allowing additional height more will and that will increase density overall. The 600-foot height limit in the O1 for residential buildings, which have

an unlimited FAR, will also increase density. The increased congestion amounts to a tax that current residents will have to pay, something they did not bargain for. Increasing height in the O2 district will cause his property value to fall by hundreds of thousands of dollars, and the same will be true for other residents in the building. The recommendation of the Committee risks a contentious process with Downtown residents.

Mr. Dave Marcus, also a resident of Bellevue Towers, said he had spent a great deal of time going through all of the available materials and reached the conclusion that he was being misled. The essentially undeveloped area of the O2 district between 105th Avenue NE and 106th Avenue NE and NE 4th Street and Main Street is where everything is going to happen. The visuals that were so carefully put together do not at all reflect the original proposal to increase height from 250 to 400 in the O2 district and up to 200 feet for office and 300 feet for residential in the MU. The diagrams in fact show buildings that are much shorter. There simply has not been enough time given for Downtown residents to digest the information and formulate a response. He said he was very clearly informed by the realtor and the property manager at the time he purchased his Bellevue Towers unit that to the west no buildings could go above 450 feet, and that everything to the south would be limited to 250 feet. He said his decision to purchase was predicated on that information. Now heights of up to 600 feet have been proposed without any supporting documentation indicating why that much height is needed.

Ms. Barb Taylor, 500 106th Avenue NE, said she had heard the Committee state that significant time has been invested in seeking public input but did not feel the statement was true. She said she also has been sold a bill of goods. The switch from condominiums to apartments by the Kemper Development Company project kind of makes sense, but livability will become more transient as a result. Bigger is not always better. And angling buildings will not be the complete answer.

Mr. Jonathan Kagle, 9342 Vineyard Crest, spoke as president of the Vuecrest Community Association. He thanked the Committee and the staff for being so considerate of the neighborhoods that surround the Downtown and which help to make the Downtown great. One main reason people move to the neighborhoods around the Downtown is the proximity to the Downtown. The great things that have happened and are happening in the Downtown are causing property values in the neighborhoods to rise. The Northwest Village area is, however, different from other parts of the community. The deep B area did not come about by accident. It was created because there are single family homes right next to 100th Avenue NE. The proposed height increase is substantial and will create changes in light and air, sunlight and shadows, and it will impact those who live along 100th Avenue NE. The Committee should consider what the view will be from other than a helicopter, from Sunset, Vineyard Crest, or from Hilltop. It makes sense to require a comprehensive plan for the area owned by the Fortin Group.

Ms. Jackie Ramsey, 500 106th Avenue NE, said her cognitive dissonance regarding the Committee's process exists on a couple of levels. First, in no discussion about upzoning everything was the preponderance of the public sentiment taken into consideration. The talk was all about building more business and keeping commercial from being

disadvantaged over residential. The public clearly questioned why the upzoning should be done at all. Second, the Committee did not feel it had enough information on which to build a recommendation regarding parking, yet the Committee had no problem moving ahead with recommending additional height without any traffic studies, and moving forward without knowing what "extraordinary amenities" even means.

Ms. Heather Trescases thanked the Committee for the time and effort put in on behalf of the city. She applauded the members for the work done. She said she will be eager to see how the amenity system pencils out. Hopefully the city will gain some big ticket items.

(Unknown) said she is a resident of Bellevue Towers. She said she was confused as to why the Committee would recommend building height of 600 feet in one area but only 350 in another. She said she could see no rationale to it, unless that is the way specific developers want it. The residents of Bellevue Towers have not been a part of the process because many just recently found out about the study.

(Unknown), also a resident of Bellevue Towers, asked if anyone has done any studies on wind and what the impacts might be as a result of building taller towers.

Ms. Olga Herrera, a resident of Bellevue Towers, noted that she had provided staff with written comments. She voiced concern over the fact that the amenity system has not been defined or even clarified. Without knowing what the amenities will be, no one can say what the impacts of allowing additional height will be and whether the tradeoffs will be equitable. There has been talk about preserving views, and about the associated economic impacts, but no one has been addressing the emotional impacts of preserving views. Residents have emotional and spiritual connections with their views. Views enhance quality of life and they are worth preserving. Everyone with a view has a story of what their view means to them. All of that must be taken into consideration going forward.

Commissioner Laing commented that work of the Committee in many ways is only the beginning of the process. A report summarizing the Committee's recommendations will be drafted and forwarded to the City Council and then to the Planning Commission. That body will take the recommendation, review it in detail, and flush out some of the details, all in conjunction with hearing from the public. The Commission's recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council which in turn will carefully scrutinize the issues. The Downtown plan has not been updated for 30 years and it is a very big deal. There will be ample opportunity to refine the Committee's recommendation before anything is written into code.

Co-chair Simas said the City Council is free to offer comments or make changes to the Committee's report before sending it on to the Planning Commission for view. At every stage going forward, there will be opportunity for the public to offer comment.

8. ADJOURN

Co-chair Simas thanked the Committee members for their work over the last year and each person's contribution.

Co-chair Simas adjourned the meeting at 10:30 p.m.